

VZCZCXYZ0000  
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0721/01 2381529  
ZNR UUUUU ZZH  
O 251529Z AUG 08  
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1900  
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUCPDO/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY  
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY  
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY  
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY  
RHMFIUU/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC//OSAC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 000721

SENSITIVE  
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCA, L/NPV, IO/MPR,  
SECDEF FOR OSD/GSA/CN,CP>  
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC  
COMMERCE FOR BIS (ROBERTS)  
NSC FOR FLY  
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A  
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)  
SUBJECT: CWC: WRAP-UP FOR JULY 28 TO AUGUST 22, 2008

REF: A. THE HAGUE 644  
[1](#)B. GROMOLL/BEIK/WUCHTE E-MAIL 28 JULY 2008 AND  
FOLLOWING

This is CWC-037-08

-----  
SUMMARY  
-----

[1](#)1. (U) August, the traditional European vacation month, has been slow, but meetings at the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) will begin again September 1-5 for the Advisory Body on Administrative and Financial Matters (ABAF), on September 2 for the Western European and Others Group (WEOG), and September 3 for Article VII consultations.

[1](#)2. (U) Preparations are ongoing for the Executive Council representatives' visit to the Russian destruction facility at Shchuchye September 8 -11. Delrep Granger, new co-chair of the Geneva Group at OPCW, helped plan the first meeting of the Group on September 5 to take advantage of a briefing from ABAF representatives. Delreps continued a series of discussions with OPCW and other delegations on a possible workshop on Security Council Resolution 1540, and the re-activation of Article VII and Article XI consultations. Details of these meetings follow.

-----  
EC VISIT to SHCHUCHYE  
-----

[1](#)3. (U) On July 31, Delrep attended a coordination meeting for the Executive Council (EC) visit to the Russian Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility at Shchuchye. The Russian delegation distributed a more detailed itinerary than previously had been provided with the circulation of the original proposal in May (copy forwarded to Washington). The participants in the visit have been confirmed as EC Chair Amb. Tomova (Slovakia) and representatives of Germany, Costa Rica, Algeria, and Pakistan. From the Secretariat,

the Director-General (DG), Gabriela Coman-Enescu (Senior Chemical Demilitarization Officer), and an interpreter will participate.

14. (SBU) Delreps later met with WEOG coordinator Ruth Surkau, and raised the idea of WEOG visit participants briefing the group before and after the visit. Surkau seemed to agree that this would be useful, but noted that the final decision would be WEOG's to take and that this could be discussed at the first WEOG meeting on September 2.

15. (U) On August 22, Delrep attended a follow-up coordination meeting to address outstanding logistical issues for the visit to Shchuchye. Russian Deputy Perm Rep Konstantin Gavrilov announced that he will accompany the participants from The Hague to Shchuchye. He also noted that letters authorizing participants' travel had been sent for visa issuance.

16. (U) Gavrilov confirmed that Victor Kholstov, the head of Russia's chemical weapons destruction program in the Ministry of Industry (formerly the Federal Agency for Industry) will travel to The Hague on September 4 and will present a briefing to participants on September 5. The DG and Coman-Enescu announced that the Technical Secretariat will also present a briefing, following Kholstov's.

-----  
GENEVA GROUP  
-----

17. (U) On August 1, Delrep Granger met with Diana Gosens (Netherlands) and Angela Peart (Canada) to discuss plans for the Geneva Group. Gosens and Granger are the new co-chairs for the group, Peart the outgoing chair. They agreed to hold a meeting the morning of September 5 in advance of the start of budget negotiations on September 8. Delrep suggested including a briefing from some ABAF members to get an overview of the ABAF meeting (September 1-5) and to highlight areas of interest or concern in the draft budget.

-----  
ARTICLE VII  
-----

18. (U) On August 21, Delreps met with Said Moussi (Algeria), the new facilitator for Article VII. Moussi said the he plans to hold a number of consultations during the first half of September, with the first meeting scheduled for September 3. Moussi indicated his desire to have a decision on Article VII adopted by the Conference of States Parties (CSP) in December. He noted that he has been working on a bare-bones draft decision and might circulate it during the September 3 meeting to stimulate discussion.

-----  
ARTICLE XI  
-----

19. (SBU) Also on August 21, Delreps met for lunch with Li Hong, the facilitator for Article XI, and Gao Huijin of the Chinese delegation. Li is planning to begin consultations early in September, but has not yet scheduled a meeting. He said he has new papers from the Dutch and Japanese delegations, but he has not yet received for distribution the Indian paper presented verbally at the last session. In response to Delrep's questions, he said that the Iranian opposition to the Cuban proposal for a workshop remains firm, but he had not been able to extract specific objections from the Iranians. Li noted

privately that the Iranian delegates remaining in The Hague after the departure of Ambassador Ziaraan and Shahrokh Shakerian are the more difficult ones to work with, seeming unable to compromise from hard-line positions. Li, who is due to transfer at the end of the year, said that his goal is to keep the facilitation going; he did not expect much progress or a major decision by the Conference of States Parties in December.

-----  
UNSCR 1540 WORKSHOP  
-----

¶10. (SBU) On July 30, Delreps met with French delegate Annie Mari and three of her staff, German Ambassador Werner Burkart, and UK delegate Karen Wolstenholme to discuss possibilities for a workshop on UNSCR 1540 at the OPCW in conjunction with the annual National Authorities meeting in late November (ref B). The French delegation informed the group that they were working on a proposal (as current EU president) for an EU-sponsored workshop on national implementation looking at the same timeframe and National Authorities audience. They had met with OPCW Chief of Cabinet Ekwall that morning, and described his reaction to the proposal as skeptical, both concerning timing and use of the EU Joint Action funding. The OPCW was about to send out invitations to the National Authorities meeting and was not very receptive to late additions to the program.

¶11. (SBU) Delrep described for the European allies the USG interest in a workshop on 1540 at OPCW, preliminary discussions that U.S. 1540 Coordinator Wuchte had had with OPCW officials at international organizations' meetings, and why we thought the National Authorities meeting a prime audience for such a workshop. The European delegates all agreed that following the political battles with Iran and the NAM during the recent Review Conference over UN Security Council resolutions on terrorism, and 1540 in particular, the time is not right to highlight a session on 1540 at the OPCW, especially its counter-terrorism angle. A lower profile segment of a national implementation seminar, they thought, would be more productive.

¶12. (SBU) Mari, the chair of the Open Ended Working Group on Terrorism, stated that she did not want to sponsor a 1540 workshop under the OEWG; she said the group had already "done 1540" in a meeting in 2007 featuring Amb. Peter Burian, Chairman of the UN's 1540 committee. Wolstenholme noted that to attract active participation by the developing countries in an event on national implementation and 1540 (which they see as training lectures), adding a "carrot" segment on Article XI assistance programs (in which they are more interested) would be helpful.

¶13. (SBU) As the European delegates were about to leave on August holiday, Mari asked Amb. Burkart to try to meet with OPCW Deputy Director General Freeman to formally register the EU's interest in expanding the National Authorities meeting with an implementation workshop that could include portions on UNSCR 1540 and Article XI. Burkart scheduled a meeting with Freeman on August 1 and invited U.S. Delreps to join him. The DDG's Special Advisor Richards also sat in. Freeman stated that the Director General has been quite open to ideas for expanding the National Authorities meeting, and that they had already added a full day with a focus on industry issues. He did not want to delay sending invitations out, but he suggested that the EU and U.S. consider proposing a program for the Monday (December 1) between the National Authorities meeting and the Conference of States Parties. There is currently nothing on the schedule that day that could

not be moved, he said. If the EU and U.S. developed a specific proposal for the bridge Monday between the meetings, the Director General would certainly consider it.

¶14. (SBU) On 1540, Freeman asked whether the U.S. would need to have a "1540 banner" on the event. He and Richards both felt that a workshop focused specifically on 1540 would not attract developing countries' representatives, and they were concerned about the political reaction from certain countries, notably Iran, after the Review Conference. Delrep replied that she would send his inquiry to Washington, but that it seemed more important to have a productive session with a real outcome than what it was labeled.

¶15. (SBU) On August 5, Delreps met with Malik Ellahi, head of Government Relations and Political Affairs, and Valeria Santori of his staff to discuss prospects for a 1540 segment to be included in a workshop focused on national implementation of the CWC. Ellahi advised that his earlier draft proposal on 1540 that he had shared with 1540 Coordinator Wuchte had been transferred to Director of Special Projects Paturej. Ellahi agreed with Delreps that Paturej's emphasis on the counter-terrorism aspects of 1540 would not be politically productive at this time. He believed a 1540 segment included in an EU-sponsored implementation workshop could be useful and would draw less criticism than a workshop with a 1540 focus. He said he and his staff would be happy to help with the project if the OCPW hierarchy approved their participation.

¶16. (SBU) Delreps met with OPCW Special Projects Director Krzysztof Paturej on August 8, when he returned from leave, to go over Washington's comments on his draft 1540 proposal (ref B). Paturej said he had taken to heart his discussions with U.S. 1540 Coordinator Wuchte and ISN/CB Director Mikulak and agreed that a counter-terrorism focus on 1540 would not be wise. He had also discussed the matter with the Director General who had stipulated that a 1540 workshop not be at the OPCW, not be funded with OPCW money, and not be chaired by OPCW staff. Paturej had already, like the U.S. and EU, looked to the November National Authorities meeting as the best audience to reach and had approached Dutch Ambassador Lak and the Clingendael Institute to discuss a proposal for a seminar there during the week of the National Authorities meeting. He shared a copy of his most recent proposal and asked Delreps to pass it to 1540 Coordinator Wuchte and ISN/CB Director Mikulak for comment (copy sent by e-mail August 8).

¶17. (SBU) On August 20, 2008, Delreps called on Dutch Amb. Maarten Lak to discuss the Clingendael proposal. Lak will be completing his assignment to OPCW at the end of the month but will be working at Clingendael one day a week for the next few months. He expects that one of his projects there will be the 1540 workshop. The proposal has had several revisions since the draft that Paturej passed to Delreps (new draft faxed to ISN). Lak said the Dutch government is prepared to fund the workshop and turn over planning and management to Clingendael, as they normally do for these projects. The workshop would open Wednesday evening, November 26, with a dinner and keynote speeches, and then begin work in earnest the next morning for one full day. Lak described the event as an experts meeting, with participants invited (by name) for their work on 1540, including academic, NGO, government officials and representatives of international organizations. He himself would like to broaden it from a Chemical Weapons-centered focus to a 1540 focus that would include biological and nuclear aspects; he said that

the approach to the workshop had not yet been decided. Clingendael plans to publish the results of the workshop, but the form of that publication is also to be determined. Delrep asked about Paturej's ideas for a series of workshops -- chemical to be followed by biological and nuclear. Lak said that would be a possibility, but that Clingendael and the Dutch government would need to have this first workshop be successful before committing time and resources to a longer 1540 series.

¶18. (SBU) Lak had also been in contact with Annie Mari, now returned from vacation, about a day's seminar (December 1) on national implementation sponsored by EU Joint Action funding. He thought the two events would not conflict and could perhaps employ some of the same experts on 1540 if they were willing to stay the weekend between. Delrep asked if that might not be overload on the National Authorities audience to try to do additional programs on both ends of the OPCW meeting. Lak disagreed, saying that the purposes and audiences were different--a small group of experts at Clingendael with a more strategic focus, and the EU session more of a training program for governmental practitioners and delegates. He felt both could be done and would be useful contributions to the same goal of more effective implementation of the CWC and UNSCR 1540.

¶19. (SBU) Lak inquired whether Delreps had heard anything about the Slovakian government's offer of hosting a 1540 workshop in Bratislava. Delrep said that Amb. Tomova had mentioned it before the Review Conference and before she became EC chairperson, but that she had not raised it with us recently. Lak suggested that if Slovakia sponsored travel for their UN Permanent Representative Burian, former chair of the 1540 committee, to attend the Clingendael workshop, that would be a great contribution. If they wished to host another 1540-centered event at another time, that would also be fine.

¶20. (SBU) Lak welcomed the possibility of collaboration with U.S. 1540 Coordinator Wuchte as planning for the Clingendael workshop moves forward. Clingendael will be finalizing a program and invitation list within the next few weeks to allow participants time to plan their travel in November. He and the Clingendael organizers would particularly welcome suggestions or U.S.-funded sponsorship for expert participants.

¶21. (SBU) DEL COMMENT. Delreps discussed this series of meetings with Ambassador Javits on his return to post August 25. Del believes that the Clingendael workshop is the best opportunity for a 1540-focused event with OPCW input at this time, given the political landmines surrounding UNSCR 1540 during the Review Conference. Clingendael will coordinate closely with OPCW and Ambassador Maarten Lak, who knows the issues well, and provide a neutral forum for full discussion. If the EU follows through with planning and funding for a broader implementation workshop on Monday, December 1, such an event could also be useful. Del does not see a direct role for the United States or this delegation in sponsoring either of these events, although recommendations for expert presenters and participants would be welcomed.

¶22. (U) Javits sends.  
Culbertson